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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 9 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Other

If other, please specify:

Usual presentation of an unusual disease.

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This is rather usual presentation of an unusual variety of renal tumour. I accept that this could be considered as case report in JMCR but could spot quite a few points of disagreements in the fundamental notion regarding the disease and the approach to the case-management (perhaps shortcoming of the article presentation) and inadequate argument in reaching the conclusion. I have made a word document of your article pointing out some errors and making several comments in the appropriate areas which I will mail to editorial@jmedicalcasereports.com. Prechemotherapy biopsy is mentioned in case one with a diagnosis of metastatic adenocarcinoma (which is not obviously urothelial tumour though you have mentioned it as uroepithelial tumour). In the second case, chemotherapy is said to have been given as for uroepithelial tumour metastasis without any biopsy guidance. I would have expected tyrosine kinase inhibitors if renal cell ca metastasis is suspected before making a
categorical diagnosis of CDC. I think your article would need thorough revision before re-submission.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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